

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 18-57, and 59-93 are pending. Claims 1, 15, 27, 28, 30, 59, and 60 are amended; claims 16, 17, and 58 are cancelled; and new claims 80-93 are added herein.

Objection to the Drawings

A Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, which was attached to the Office Action of March 15, 2004, indicates that margins for Figures 6, 10, 24, 25, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37-41, 85, and 89 are unacceptable. The margins in these figures have been corrected and substitute drawings are attached in Appendix A. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

Priority

The Examiner noted that certified copies of several Japanese priority documents have not been received. Applicants will submit certified copies of these documents at a later date.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to the numbering of the claims. Applicants inadvertently included two claims listed as claim 14 and two claims listed as claim 15. The new listing of claims, presented herein, follows the Examiner's suggestion, such that former claim 15 at page 46, lines 1-2 is now claim 78. Similarly, former claim 14 at page 46, lines 4-11 is now claim 79.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8, 13-15, 18-20, 58-71, and 78-79 were rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by Ambroziak (U.S. Patent No. 6,415,319). Applicants have amended the pending claims to clarify the distinguishing characteristics between the pending claims and Ambroziak. As presented below, the claims as amended are distinguishable from Ambroziak and overcome the Examiner's rejections.

The amended claims clearly articulate the distinction between the present invention and data processing systems, such as those disclosed in Ambroziak. For example, claim 1, as amended, requires "setting means for setting a condition for web page data to be saved, in advance of acquiring the web page data" and "determination means for determining whether the acquired web page data satisfies the condition" and "indexing means for assigning a predetermined index to the web page data if the web page data is determined to satisfy the condition, said index dynamically assigned to the web page data" and "saving means for saving the web page data determined to satisfy the condition and the assigned index in a predetermined storage unit."

Similarly, claim 59, as amended, requires "a setting step of setting a condition for web page data to be saved, in advance of acquiring the web page data" and "a determination step of determining whether or not the acquired web page data satisfies the condition" and "an indexing step of assigning a predetermined index to the web page data if the web page data is determined to satisfy the condition, without inputting any index" and "a saving step of saving the web page data determined to satisfy the condition with the assigned index in a predetermined storage unit."

Similarly, claim 60, as amended, requires “setting a condition for web page data to be saved, in advance of acquiring the web page data” and “determining whether the acquired web page data satisfies the condition” and “assigning a predetermined index to the web page data if the web page is determined to satisfy the condition” and “saving the web page data determined to satisfy the condition with the assigned index in a predetermined storage unit.”

Claims 1, 59, and 60 require setting a condition is prior to acquiring any web page data, comparing the condition and web page data, and storing the web page data and an index if the condition is satisfied. In contrast, Ambroziak discloses a system in which an index server 130 extracts conceptual information from a web page and stores the extracted conceptual information with a URL of the web page as an index. The system does not save the web page and stores the URL irrespective of any condition. Applicants believe that amended claims 1, 59, and 60 and new claims 80-93 articulate a patentable distinction over Ambroziak.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-12, 16-17, 21-39, 40-57, 72-77 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ambroziak as applied above, and further in view of various other references. Applicants have amended the pending claims to clarify the distinguishing characteristics between the present invention, as recited in the claims, and Ambroziak and thereby overcome the Examiner’s rejections.

For the same reasons discussed above with respect to anticipation, Applicants believe that the amended claims clearly articulate the distinction between the present invention and data processing systems, such as those disclosed in Ambroziak. Claims 9-12, 16-17, 21-39, 40-57, 72-77 ultimately depend from amended claim 1 or amended claim 60. Therefore, these claims each require a limitation that is not present in Ambroziak.

Applicants will not address the Examiner's representations with respect to the other cited prior art because Ambroziak formed the basis for all of the pending rejections. Applicants' ability to distinguish the pending independent claims over Ambroziak, therefore, addresses all of the pending rejections. For example, Ambroziak does not save the web page and stores the URL irrespective of any condition.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 80-93. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added and that support for these claims can be found throughout the specification. See e.g. page 32. Each of these claims requires the same limitations that distinguish the previously discussed claims from Ambroziak. Applicants, therefore, believe these claims to be patentable.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4233-4002. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4233-4002. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: June 15, 2004

By: 

Richard Martinelli
Registration No. 52,003
(212) 758-4800 Telephone
(212) 751-6849 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154-0053